

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1852.

Subscribers who do not file the *Era*, and have numbers 249, 261, 262, and 264, on hand, will confer a favor by remitting them to this office, at our expense.

PARTIES IN THE SOUTH.

The Constitutional Union Party, which has obtained temporary control of the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia, is somewhat divided in opinion as to the course it shall pursue in the approaching Presidential canvass. Some of its Democratic members are anxious that it should send delegates to the Baltimore Democratic Convention, for the purpose of checking the Free-Soilers, and securing the nomination of a Union man acceptable to the South—rather a hazardous step.

What kind of credentials would such delegates present? Repudiating the old Democratic organization, how could they expect to be received as members of a Democratic Convention? Would the Northern Democrats, wedded as they are to established usages, consent to receive a mongrel delegation, representing a hostile organization, and seeking admission avowedly for the purpose of communicating what are called Free Soil Democrats?

Thus far the suggestion has not found much favor. The policy of the Union Party of the South, so far as disclosed by its principal organs, is to maintain its independence, decline participation in the Conventions of the old parties, to hold itself in reserve for the purpose of deciding on the comparative merits of the nominations of those Conventions when submitted to the public. The Alabama Union men have called a National Convention, to meet in this city, after the other Conventions shall have acted.

Mr. Stephens, a member of the House from Georgia, has lately written a letter to a gentleman in Georgia, in which he unequivocally opposes the proposition to send delegates to the Baltimore Convention, arguing that the true course of the Union men is to demand recognition by the Conventions of the Whigs and Democrats, as a condition precedent, because the condition of the claims of their nominations assumes that the old political organizations are "effete and corrupt," utterly untrustworthy for the protection of Southern rights, and insists that the Alabama recommendation of a National Union Convention in Washington city should be responded to by every friend of the South.

A few extracts will serve to show the position of the leading Union men of the South.

"If those members of that Convention [Baltimore] from the South, who were lately so loud in their denunciation of all men at the North, and who were so particularly obnoxious to our position at home, shall acknowledge their errors and put themselves upon our principles, and shall purge that body of its Free Soil elements, and shall also present to the country a good candidate for the Presidency, it will be time enough for us to connect ourselves with their action after they shall have given us these evidences of their being entitled to our confidence and co-operation. A good candidate, standing on our principles, and put forward by an organization standing upon the same principles, is all we want."

"If that Convention, therefore, so called, and so constituted, and so organized, other National Conventions, whether Democratic or Whig, must be put right on the record as a condition precedent, before looking to me for my support or countenance. I speak only for myself. The Constitutional Union Party can speak for itself when its Convention assembles. But can any one doubt that the moral power and influence of our position upon the action of the Baltimore Convention would be much greater outside than inside of its deliberations? Would they be less likely to comply with our demands from fear of our disapproval in case of refusal, than to be controlled by our wishes after a voluntary surrender?"

It might be well for our Free Soil friends of the North to ask themselves a similar question.

"No occasion has yet arisen for an appeal to the whole people of the United States upon the principles of our organization. Whether such an occasion shall arise, may depend upon the action of this Baltimore Convention. Alabama has already called a National Convention on the principles of the Union, in this city after the Baltimore Convention. To this latter Convention we should not fail to send delegates. Should such a state of things then exist as to render a new national organization necessary and proper to carry out our principles, I feel assured that the late results in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, upon the point of what may be expected in other sections of the country, when similar efforts may be made for similar objects. And in this connection I will add that the idea of reorganizing either of the old parties in this country upon sound national principles, is in my opinion, a result not to be looked for with much probability. As organizations, these parties are both effete and corrupt. They both make professions in 'platforms' which they never carry out in practice. These platforms or programmes have become nothing but artificial devices, by which demagogues are enabled to cheat the people. 'New wine is not to be put into old bottles, else they burst.' And if the effort to infuse new and sound principles into either of these worn-out parties should be successful, a like result may be expected. It is quite improbable that it is our duty to join in the elements in each are discordant, conflicting, and hostile."

Mr. Stephens is no friend of Intervention doctrines.

"But apart from considerations growing out of the present condition of the slavery question, and other questions of domestic policy, on which there is equally as wide a difference of opinion between the two great wings of these parties arising, upon the subject of the wider differences of opinion will exist. The question of interfering with and taking part in European politics will soon be upon us. 'Coming events cast their shadows before.' At this time we see a man of unusual address and great ability, traversing the Northern States of the Union, and urging the people to the abandonment of those principles which have been coeval with the existence of our Government in our relations with the various monarchies and dynasties of the Old World. His object evidently is to implant in the public mind the principle that it is our duty to join in a general crusade for the liberties of mankind. These wild and disorganizing doctrines have been embodied in resolutions and adopted with enthusiasm by large and respectable meetings in diverse places. The day is not distant when the questions involved in these doctrines will become practical issues. They will present subjects of vast magnitude and momentous importance for the consideration of the American people. And upon them, as well as upon the just kindred questions to which I have alluded, we should stand aloof from all parties that do not purge themselves from all affiliation and association with Free-Soilism. Whatever may be the course of future events, we should stand by our principles where they may lead us, 'through woe' as well as

"through weal," and maintain them now, and always, if need be, until they, we, and the Republic, perish together in a common ruin."

BUFFALO AND BALTIMORE—1848 AND 1852.

"I confess myself disappointed in the results of the Buffalo Convention. To one at the time it did seem that the people had become thoroughly awake, both to their rights and their duties, and that party attachments are no longer to prevent a manly, fearless assertion of the rights of the free North to take the control of the Government, and to wield it in favor of liberty."

"While I believe that that demonstration did exert a salutary influence on the then pending election, I am constrained to admit that the high hopes then formed have faded away, and left the sad conviction that the people of the free States are yet to learn lessons of deep humiliation, before they will rise to the true position and dignity of freemen."—*Extract of a Letter from A. A. Guthrie to the Free Soil Convention of Ohio.*

The organization of the friends of Freedom represented by the Convention which met at Buffalo on the 9th and 10th of August, 1848, was a reorganization of the Liberty party of 1840, rendered necessary by the new and extraordinary schemes of Slavery. A vast extent of free territory had been obtained by conquest from a sister Republic, which was intended by a Slaveholding Administration to be converted to the uses of Slave Labor. The Slave Power made no secret of its purpose. Slavery was to be planted in the new Territory, in defiance of its local law: new slave States were to be developed, to increase the political power of Slaveholders in Congress and the Electoral College, so as to secure and perpetuate their ascendancy: the necessity of Emancipation was to be indefinitely postponed, by laying the foundation of an indefinite extension of Slave territory; and for the execution of this plan the whole power of the Federal Government was sustained as it is by a People three-fourths of whom reside in non-slaveholding States, and four-fifths of whom are opposed to the perpetuation of Slavery, was to be placed under control.

The public mind was profoundly agitated; the People of the free States protested loudly against the scheme; old political organizations were shaken; and when they embarked in the Presidential contest of 1848, with declarations and nominations from which no effectual resistance against Slaveholding usurpation could be expected, numerous voters who had till then acted with them indicated their anxiety to enter a protest at the ballot-box against their policy.

The Liberty men, in accordance with their usages, had already held their Convention and nominated their candidates, but they did not wish to be in the way of a movement in the right direction more comprehensive than their own. If they maintained their position, they might receive some accessions from the ranks of the disaffected members of the old parties, but the great body of these would either return to their allegiance, retire in disgust from the struggle, or proclaim nominations of their own. In any event, there would have been no such demonstration at the polls as would have embarrassed the plans and impaired the force of the Slavery Propagandists. On the contrary, by agreeing to unite with their fellow-citizens, who were prepared to take an anti-slavery position, they would secure unity in the ranks of the friends of Freedom, impress their own principles upon the new organization, and aid in a political movement imposing in aspect and beneficent in effects.

Wise, as we think, they determined upon the latter course, and the Buffalo Convention was the result. This gave form and efficiency to nearly all the active, independent anti-slavery sentiment of the country. The platform of political action it agreed upon contained substantially the creed of the Liberty party on the subject of Slavery, only in a form more precise, less liable to misconstruction, and better adapted to the exigencies of the times; and, in addition, a declaration of principles upon other political questions, which must be considered and acted upon by the People, and for the just disposition of which every voter must bear his share of responsibility.

In other words, the Liberty party ceased to be a party of one idea. In its reorganized form, without sacrificing any principle it had urged in relation to Slavery, it proclaimed principles applicable to all other political questions. It had ceased to be sectional—it was now National. Its platform was the Constitution—its scope, commensurate with the objects of the Constitution.

We see nothing to regret in the whole movement. It was wisely planned, well executed, and its results, temporary and permanent, have been all that could reasonably be expected.

We did not elect our own candidates, but we contributed to, if we did not cause, the defeat of a candidate, who had made himself singularly obnoxious by his concessions to Slavery, and whose success would have promoted the accomplishment of all its schemes.

We did not poll one-half of the votes of the Union, but our vote was large enough to show the politicians of the ruling party that they could not look for success, while trampling under foot every principle of Democracy.

We did not succeed in obtaining a positive act from Congress prohibiting Slavery in the Territories, but the power of the movement was represented as such, as to constrain the new Administration to countenance measures favorable to our views, such as to weaken the dependence of the Slaveholders in their own countries respecting the title to their slaves in free territory, such as to impregnate the tide of emigration to California with the anti-slavery spirit, thereby inducing the formation of a non-slaveholding State on the Pacific, by which our entire Western seaboard was consecrated to Freedom.

Among the other results attributable to this movement, directly or indirectly, are, the repeal of the Black Laws of Ohio; the election of from ten to fifteen members of the House for two successive Congresses, acting independently of organizations when controlled by slavery; the Senate of Messrs. Chase and Sumner to the Senate of the United States; the control of Wisconsin, Ohio, New York, and Massachusetts, by coalitions, not to be coerced into submission to the dictates of the Slave Power; distraction in the old political organizations all subservient to Slavery, which thus far no efforts have succeeded in allaying; a more general discussion of questions of slavery, in Congress and out than had ever taken place before; and such a state of the public mind as to have checked, if not extinguished, the project of Cuban annexation. Nor must we forget that it was under the pressure of this Buffalo Convention, that the Oregon Bill, with its clause prohibiting Slavery, was carried through Congress.

That more has not been accomplished, is no argument against a movement that has accomplished so much. It was not to be expected that the old parties would be at once reformed, or annihilated, that the power of Slavery would be instantly subverted, that politicians would be all converted into philanthropists, and the masses of the People be all aroused to a full sense of what was due the cause of Freedom. Those who expected this have of course been disappointed: they expected more than any cause, short of a miracle, could produce.

Suppose there had been no Buffalo Convention, no such united movement against the pretensions of Slavery in 1848, as was represented by that meeting, what then? The Liberty Party, with its one idea, might have cast its own proper vote—fifty, sixty, it may be, eighty, thousand—and, instead of the press of the North generally, agitating and protesting on the subject of Slavery, the agitation would have been confined chiefly to the journals of that Party, and have soon abated among the People at large; and instead of the co-operative policy among the friends of freedom of all parties, which has been so successful in the election of prominent anti-slavery men, and overthrow of politicians conspicuous for their loyalty to Slavery, the old policy of isolation would have been adhered to, until every man of practical views and interested in questions affecting the public welfare, had been alienated.

Let us try again. We are determined that California shall remain free—that Slavery shall not find foothold in New Mexico and Utah—that, while not interfering through the Federal Government with Slavery where it exists, under the protection of State laws, it shall not, beyond their jurisdiction, claim title and protection under the Constitution of the United States—that the element of Freedom, the fundamental idea of Democracy, shall have its legitimate weight in the Federal Councils, and that Slavery shall not prescribe tests of fellowship in national parties, and of position in national affairs. We are determined to withdraw our support from all factitious support from it, the support of the Federal Government from it, understanding that whenever the limit is fixed beyond which it cannot pass, and it must live only under the protection of State laws and upon State resources, it will soon come to be regarded by its supporters not as an institution to be perpetuated, but as an evil to be got rid of.

With this determination in regard to Slavery, it will be easy to agree upon our course in relation to other important questions. We have done it once—we can do it again. The old Buffalo platform is still in good condition—a plank or two less, a plank or two more, and we shall have a sound, broad basis, Constitutional, Democratic, American.

We need not be precipitate. Premature action is not necessary to bind us who have no doubt respecting the action of the old Party Conventions in the spring, and must tend to repel those who still cherish a lingering hope of the defeat of Hunkerism. We cannot blame the anti-slavery adherents of the old parties, who have determined to do all they can to give a right direction to their Conventions, proposing independent action only in the event of failure. If they fail, as they will, independent action will become their duty. Allegiance to Party is due only while Party maintains allegiance to its principles. The Whig who has claimed that his Party is for Freedom and Progress, and has protested against the Compromise and Fugitive Law, cannot go with it when through its National Convention it shall commit itself to these measures, and against Freedom and Progress. The Democrat who holds that his Party is for Human Rights, believes that a majority ought to rule, rejects the fetters of vested rights and finality in legislation, cannot go with it when through its National Convention it shall trample upon every principle he cherishes.

What, then, will they do? Disfranchise themselves? Do nothing, because their Parties have done wrong? Hide their light under a bushel? Permit the Ballot-Box to speak but one language, that of submission to the Slave Power? Never! With that select band of voters who have never yet "bent the knee to the dark spirit of Slavery," they will rally on the basis of the Principles, and for the accomplishment of the Objects, proclaimed by the Convention of Freedom that met at Buffalo in 1848.

What are these Principles and Objects? They are stated in the following resolutions:

SLAVERY.

Resolved, That we, the people here assembled, remembering the example of our fathers in the days of the first Declaration of Independence, putting our trust in God for the triumph of our cause, and invoking his guidance in our endeavors to advance it, do now plant our feet upon the National Platform of Freedom, in opposition to the sectional platform of Slavery.

Resolved, That slavery in the several States of this Union which recognize its existence, depends upon State laws alone, which cannot be repealed or modified by the Federal Government, and for which laws that Government is not responsible. We therefore propose no interference by Congress with slavery within the limits of any State.

Resolved, That the proviso of Jefferson to prohibit the existence of slavery after 1800 in all the Territories of the United States, South, East, and North; the votes of the Southern and Northern, in the Congress of 1784, for the proviso, to three States and seven delegates against it; the actual exclusion of slavery from the Northwest Territory, by the Ordinance of 1787, unanimously adopted by the States in Congress; and the National Platform of Freedom, clearly show that it was the settled policy of the nation not to extend, nationalize, or encourage, but to limit, localize, and discourage, slavery; and to this policy, which should never have been departed from, the Government ought to return.

Resolved, That our Fathers ordained the Constitution of the United States, in order, among other great national objects, to establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty, but expressly denied to the Federal Government, which they created, all constitutional power to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due legal process.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this Convention, Congress has no more power to make a slave than to make a king; no more power to institute or establish slavery than to institute or establish a monarchy—no such power can be found among those specifically conferred by the Constitution or derived by just implication from them.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the Federal Government to relieve itself from all responsibility for the existence or continuance of slavery, wherever that Government possesses constitutional authority to legislate on that subject, and is thus responsible for its existence.

Resolved, That the true, and, in the judgment of this Convention, the only safe means of preventing the extension of slavery into territory now free, is to prohibit its existence in all such territory by an act of Congress.

Resolved, That we accept the issue which the slave power has forced upon us, and to their demand for more slave States, and more slave Territories, our calm but final answer is, No more slave States, and no more slave Territory. Let the soil of our extensive domain be ever kept free for the hardy pioneers of our own land, and the oppressed and banished of other lands, seeking homes of comfort and fields of enterprise in the new world.

CHEAP POSTAGE—RETRENCHMENT—UNNECESSARY OFFICES—ELECTIONS BY THE PEOPLE.

Resolved, That we demand cheap postage for the people; a retrenchment of the expenses and patronage of the Federal Government; the abolition of all unnecessary offices and salaries; and the election by the people of all civil officers in the service of the Government, so far as the same may be practicable.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Resolved, That River and Harbor Improvements, when demanded by the safety and convenience of commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, are objects of national concern, and it is the duty of Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, to provide therefor.

LAND FOR THE LANDLESS.

Resolved, That the free grant to actual settlers of the public lands shall be.

Let us, in consideration of the expenses they incur in making settlements in the wilderness, which are usually fully equal to their actual cost, and of the public benefits resulting therefrom, of reasonable portions of the public lands under suitable limitations, is a wise and just policy of public policy, and will promote in various ways the interests of all the States of this Union; and we therefore recommend it to the favorable consideration of the American People.

Resolved, That the obligations of honor and patriotism require the earliest practicable payment of the public debt, and that we are, therefore, in favor of such a tariff of duties as will raise revenue adequate to defray the necessary expenses of the Federal Government and to pay annual instalments of our debt and the interest thereon.

Resolved, That we inscribe on our banner "Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor, and Free Men," and under it will fight on and fight over, until a triumphant victory shall reward our exertions.

We should prefer a resolution in relation to the Tariff, recognizing distinctly the Principle of Free Trade, but that adopted at Buffalo is in the usual Democratic form, resting the policy of a Tariff not on the doctrine of protection, but upon the necessity of raising revenue.

It might be well to add to this platform an affirmation in regard to the Principle of Intervention, so ably advocated in a recent speech in the House by Mr. Giddings, and the following form adopted by the late Ohio State Democratic Convention might serve the purpose:

Resolved, That we recognize the sovereign and inalienable right of every nation to establish and maintain such form of government as they may deem best, and that we are, therefore, in favor of such a tariff of duties as will raise revenue adequate to defray the necessary expenses of the Federal Government and to pay annual instalments of our debt and the interest thereon.

Resolved, That the law of nations is in the keeping of nations; that a breach of it by one of them is an offence against all the others; and that they are under a duty to themselves and to each other, to prevent or punish such infraction by all means not incompatible with their own interests."

Let it be remembered that the Buffalo Convention contained a full representation of the Radical Democracy of New York; that many of its leading actors were Barnburners, so called; that the resolutions were reported by a committee in which eighteen States were represented, the chairman of which was Benjamin F. Butler, a distinguished New York Democrat; that the platform adopted was fully sustained by the real Democracy of that State, and received the sanction of Martin Van Buren, who was also chosen as the standard-bearer of the new organization. Where will this gentleman, and those who sympathize with him, be found in 1852? In opposition to a policy they sustained in 1848? Supporting what in 1848 they opposed? It was the inadmissible demand of the Slave Power in 1848, and the submission to this demand by the Baltimore nominee for the Presidency, that drove them into a course of independent action: will they sanction a similar demand and submission in 1852? Will the men who insisted four years ago upon divorcing the Federal Government from Slavery, sustain a Convention whose action will be directed towards subjecting the former to the latter for the next four years? Will the men who four years ago voted against General Cass, vote for him now, with his views unchanged, or for a candidate holding precisely the same views in regard to Slavery? Time will determine. Let us not judge our friends hastily, but assume that when the hour shall come for a decision, their conduct will be consistent with their past course, and in harmony with the claims of Principle.

MOVEMENT IN THE HOUSE ON THE COMPROMISE MEASURES.

Dr. Etch of Indiana, who was first elected to Congress on the strength of an Anti-Slavery pledge, moved a suspension of the rules, last Monday, for the purpose of introducing a resolution in support of the Compromise, and against Anti-Slavery agitation. The roll being called, the following absentees were excused, several on account of sickness:

Messrs. Allen of Massachusetts, Bibb, Brough, Brown of New Jersey, Buell, Burd, Caldwell, Cleveland, Colecock, Cullum, Darby, Dimmick, Floyd, Goodrich, Hamilton, Hays, Hildreth, Hovey, Hunt, Johnson, Hunter, Mann, Marshall of Kentucky, Martin, Millson, Miner, Robinson, Russell, Scudder, Scurry, Stevens of New York, Sweetser, Toombs, Tuck, and Walsh.

For the absence of the following gentlemen, no excuses were offered:

Messrs. Babcock, Bove, Cottman, Dunham, Gilmore, Ives, Marshall of California, and Riddle.

All further proceedings under the call were then dispensed with.

And the question recurring on the motion to suspend the rules, it was put, and decided in the negative by the following vote—two-thirds not voting therefor:

YEAS—Messrs. Abernethy, Willis Allen, John Appleton, Charles Appleton, Ainslie, Everett, David J. Bailey, Thomas H. Bayly, Beale, Binell, Brookbridge, Briggs, Brooks, A. G. Brown, Burrows, Bushy, Edward C. Cabell, Caske, Chastain, Churchwell, Clark, Cobb, Curtis, John G. Davis, Dawson, Dismek, Dockwiler, Edwards, Ewing, Evans, Fox, Fuller, Thomas J. D. Fuller, Gamble, Gentry, Giddings, Gilmore, Gorman, Grey, Hall, Hammond, Isaac H. Harris, Sampson W. Harris, Hart, Hays, Hovey, Hendricks, Henn, Hibbard, Howard, Howell, Ives, Leger, Jackson, A. Johnson, James Johnson, R. W. Johnson, Geo. W. Jones, J. Glancy Jones, Kuhn, Kurtz, Landry, Letcher, Lockhart, Mace, Humphrey Randolph, Mason, McCorkle, McDonald, McLannahan, McMullen, McNeir, Meade, Miller, John Moore, Monahan, Morrison, Murphy, Nibbs, Olds, Ottum, Andrew Paul, Porter, P. Parker, Peaslee, Penn, Phelps, Polk, Porter, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, Savage, Schermerhorn, Scurry, Origen S. Seymour, Skelton, Smith, Stanley, Frederick P. Stanton, Richard H. Stanton, Alexander H. Stephens, Stone, St. Martin, Strother, Stuart, Sutherland, Taylor, Benjamin Thompson, George W. Thompson, Venable, Ward, Watkins, Addison White, Alexander White, Wilson, Williams—119.

NAVS—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Andrews, Babcock, Bayard, Beardsell, Bell, Bennett, Bove, Boyd, Brimton, Joseph C. Bell, L. D. Campbell, Thompson Campbell, Carter, Chandler, Chapman, Gillingham, Conger, Daniel, George T. Davis, Dano, Doty, Duncan, Durkee, Eastman, Egerton, Fowler, Gaylord, Goodnow, Green, Howell, Hays, Hildreth, Hovey, Horford, T. Y. Howe, Jew, Jenkins, John Johnson, Daniel T. Jones, George G. King, Preston King, McQueen, Mescham, Molony, Henry D. Moore, Murray, Newton, Orr, Pennington, Perkins, Price, Ransom, Robie, Ross, Sackett, Schuchman, Schooner, D. L. Seymour, Smart, Snow, B. S. Stanton, Thaddeus Stewart, Stratton, Thurston, Townsend, Taylor, Wallace, Washburn, Welch, Wells, Wildrick, Woodward, Yates—74.

Messrs. Giddings and J. W. Howe voted to suspend the rules, for the purpose of securing a direct vote on the resolution. How many others were actuated by a similar motive, we do not know. The great majority of those voting against suspending would not vote against the resolution.

Some things are demonstrated by these proceedings. There are opponents enough of the resolution to prevent its introduction, as it requires two-thirds to suspend the rules.

There is a majority in the House in favor of the resolution, a large portion of which is composed of Northern Whigs and Democrats.

The National Conventions of both the old parties, at Buffalo and elsewhere, adopted the Compromise as their basis of action, the Representatives from Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa, indicated what the action of the delegates from those States will be.

THE "GRASSHOPPER."

THE UNION—THE DEMOCRATIC ORGAN.

The *Washington Union*, in the exercise of its functions as the "Central Organ of the Democratic Party," is pouring oil on the troubled waters of Southern Democracy. It grieves over its divisions—it deprecates the proscription of its factions, it would gather them all again in one fold, under one shepherd. It will not consent to the excommunication of the Compromise or Anti-Compromise, the Union or Disunion Democrats. No matter, though erring brethren may be carried away by an excess of devotion to State Rights, or an extravagant passion for the Union—the circumstances excuse, if they do not justify, their erratic course. One sought, by a new combination, to secure acquiescence in measures believed essential to the preservation of the Union—the other forgot for the time his loyalty to the Party, in the attempt to guard against the dangers of Northern fanaticism. The occasion for all this agitation and confusion has passed, why should the feud be kept alive? Why should there be strife? Are they not all good Democrats—all sincere and worthy members of the household of faith?

What is the effect of the allegation that the Democratic members of the Union organization of the South are renegades from their party, or, vice versa, that the Southern Rights or State Rights organization is incurably stained by disloyalty to the Constitution and the Union? Evidently a perpetuation of these feuds, and a surrender of the Government to the Whigs.

No dispassionate mind will suppose that the Democratic party of this Union can ever consider those as renegades from its service who refused to sanction the ultra schemes of the Southern Convention; and yet such would seem to be the expectation of those who assail without measure the men who did not become parties to such schemes. So, on the other hand, it would be contrary to the justice and spirit of Democracy to circumscribe within narrow limits the patriotism which guards the rights of the States, and which watches with sleepless vigilance the tendency of the Federal Government to overstep its constitutional duty."

Again: see with what tenderness it vindicates the reputation of the Union Democrats of the South:

"We have seen, with deep regret, reproaches cast upon the Democratic members of the South, because the results of the public judgment in favor of the present course of measures have not been obtained without bringing into power men who might not otherwise have been in the field. It is for example, said by many of the journals in Mississippi that it is the fault of Mr. Foote and his supporters that the gallant State is now divided, and is represented by a Union of Union and a Democratic party. All such language is libelous and unjust, and can have no other effect than to make permanent the breach which it is the wish of all true Democrats to heal."

In another paragraph, it justifies Mr. Clemens:

"It is doubtless under the sting of reproaches originating in similar misrepresentations of his position as a Union Democrat, that Senator Clemens looks with distrust upon the reorganization of parties which is taking place in his State. If he is to be proscribed for his effort to keep out of the Democratic creed the disunion projects of the Nashville Convention, it is but natural that he should hold himself ready to repel such injustice."

Will our Democratic readers now give us their attention. Messrs. Foote, Clemens, and Cobb, are not acting with the Democratic party—they lead a Coalition composed of Whigs and Democrats, known as the Constitutional Union party—and as the result of their efforts, three Whigs have lately been elected to the Senate of the United States, from Georgia, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and not one Democrat. Georgia is lost to the Democratic party for the next Presidential election; Mississippi and Alabama, hitherto Democratic States, are now doubtful; and yet, the men who have worked these disasters to the Party, are coaxed, petted, and held up, as orthodox Democrats, by the Central Democratic Organ!

This is the Southern side of the picture—look now at the Northern.

The Democrats of Massachusetts, by a masterly combination with the Free-Soilers—a party holding substantially Democratic principles—overthrew the ancient Whig dynasty in that State, and obtained the control of its destinies. For two terms in succession has a Democratic Governor wielded its executive powers; its Legislature has sent to the Senate a man, proscribed by Webster Whiggy, as imbued with the radicalism of Democracy; and its People have sent to the House a Representative who stands in the front rank of the distinguished Democrats of New England.

Here is a coalition, not of contradictory, but harmonious elements, with results of vast importance to the Democratic party. But where stands the *Washington Union*? Aloof, cold, and reproachful. It can excuse a coalition between Whigs and Democrats in the South, which has given the Whigs nearly a majority in the Senate of the United States, and indignantly repel the slightest imputation on the orthodox Democracy of the Constitutionists, but a Coalition which has overthrown the Whig party in Massachusetts, and insured to the benefit of genuine Democracy, it bitterly denounced, as it refuses now to recognize, while the leaders of it are regarded as unworthy the name of Democrats!

Again: the Democracy of Ohio, with great unanimity, united with the Free-Soilers in sending to the Senate of the United States Salmon P. Chase, the soundness of whose Democratic principles is unquestionable. From his advent in public life, he has uttered no sentiment in politics given no vote, that Democracy would dissent from. He is an Anti-Bank, Free Trade, State Rights, Human Rights, Strict Constructionist Democrat; and owing to his influence, and the efforts of those who specially sympathize with him, Governor Wood, the Democratic candidate, carried the State of Ohio by a majority unprecedented in that State. Now read what the Central Organ of the National Democratic Party has to say of the Ohio Democracy and its exponent in the Senate:

"The section of the *Appeal* that the *Washington Union* writes us, if it does not contain the *Chase Democracy* of Ohio, is unequalledly false. We have never held, nor intended, that Mr. Chase's course and position, since his election to the Senate, entitled him to be regarded as a Democrat. On the contrary, we have maintained that if he proposes to unite with the Democratic party, he must do so on a platform implying a renunciation, in the new circumstances of the country, of his Abolitionist errors."

Mr. Cobb, who stands at the head of a Coalition in Georgia, that sends a Whig to the Senate, and refuses to send delegates to the Democratic National Convention, is a capital Democrat; Mr. Foote, whose operations have resulted in the election of a Whig Senator from Mississippi, is a sterling Democrat; Mr. Clemens, who declines to act with the Democratic party, and is committed to another party, is a sound Democrat, and must not be proscribed, because he has been laboring to keep Disunion out of the Democratic creed. But Mr. Chase, whose influence secured a majority of twenty-five thousand in his State to a Democratic Governor, is no Democrat at all—and why? Because he has been laboring to keep Pro-Slavery Propaganda out of the Democratic creed, and will not consent that the Democratic party shall be the pack-horse of Slavery!

If any one can doubt, after this, the *Sinews of the Washington Union* to be the central

organ of the National Democracy, he is beyond the reach of argument. No matter how thoroughly Democratic in his views and conduct, a man may be upon all questions of public policy, if he refuse to adopt the shibboleth of Slavery, and to recognize that system as entitled to encouragement and extension under Federal auspices, he is no Democrat, in the judgment of the *Union*. Loyal to Slavery, he may be as erratic as he pleases on other questions, without forfeiting the regard of the *Union*. All other sins may be forgiven; but the sin against Slavery is unpardonable.

What says the Democracy of the North? Do they hold with their central organ, that the Democratic Church is built upon this rock? If they do, let them erect an altar to Moloch, and adopt as their symbols the chain and the lash, so that mankind may understand what American Democracy means.

THE REBUBLIC—THE WHIG ORGAN.

Having exhibited the position of the central organ of the Democratic party—such it claims to be, and the claim has not been denied—let us advert to the position of the central organ of the Whig party, the *Republic*, which claims the right to define the true nature and tests of Whiggery, and to hold the keys of St. Peter, so far as that party is concerned.

It has no word of censure for Messrs. Toombs or Stephens, or for any of those Whigs of the South who have organized a new party, in opposition to the old ones. On the contrary, it sustains them, magnifies their importance, does all it can to propitiate them, and abets their policy. In fact, whatever Southern Whigs may say or do or wish, and its face towards them is all sunshine; but when it looks towards the North, it assumes the stern severity of a Dictator. It proscribes what sort of coalitions Northern Whigs may form; what kind of opinions they may hold; it lays down the law, that no Whig shall have anything to do with Free-Soilers, shall favor Abolitionism, shall oppose the Compromise, or Fugitive Law, shall discuss in any form questions of Slavery; and it excommunicates whatever so-called Whig shall refuse to comply with this requirement. The old platform of Whiggery it has substituted by the Compromise.

"Let us glance," it says, "at the present organization of the Whigs. As far as there can be any National organization of a party, it must be indicated by the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government, and the absence of any action by a National Convention. The great test which the *Union* has hitherto applied of fidelity to Southern Rights is adherence to the Compromise. Well, the *Whig* Administration has adopted and announced two years in succession this very policy. President Fillmore, and every member of his Cabinet approve of it, and cordially support it. As far, then, as the Executive organization of the Whig party goes, it presents a sufficient protection to Southern rights. The Whigs of the present House of Representatives, the very first day of the session, adopted a resolution endorsing and reaffirming the policy laid down by the President. There were only two individuals in the caucus, Mr. Fowler and Mr. T. Stevens, who expressed dissent from this resolution. A few days since, the resolution of the Whig caucus was reaffirmed by the Whig Convention of Tennessee. Yesterday we received from the Whig Convention of Kentucky another reaffirmation of the same resolution. As far, then, as we can understand the 'present organization' of the Whig party, it is friendly to the Compromise, and can be trusted to sustain and abide by it."

Again:

"If the Whigs cannot triumph on the Compromise ground of the Administration and the President, they must be beaten; for the anti-Compromise ground is preoccupied by the Abolitionists and Secessionist Democracy."

Again:

"Such is the 'present organization' of the Whig party, that it can present no Presidential candidate who does not stand where the Whig Administration and the Whig caucus stand. There are no Whig Secessionists at the South; there are no Whig Abolitionists at the North. The 'Democracy' has absorbed all the factious. Those journalists and those politicians who denounce a Whig Administration, and the Whig members of Congress, for supporting the Compromise, who have been seeking to un-Whig the President